

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-52 remain pending. Claims 1-52 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 19, 31, 38, 39, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, and 50 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 44, 49, 50, and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,867,821, to Ballantyne ("Ballantyne").

Amended claim 1 reads as follows:

A method comprising:
representing a first collection of media objects on a first sheet having a first graphical content representing the media objects, wherein the first sheet is a cover sheet that provides access to the first collection of the media objects;
creating a second collection of media objects from the first collection of media objects; and
re-marking the first sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto the first sheet, wherein the re-marked first sheet provides access to the second collection of the media objects.

(emphasis added)

Ballantyne discloses electronically accessing and distributing information and services.

More specifically, Ballantyne discloses:

If the user has been classified as "medical personnel ", they initially enter their unique ID number to further classify them as nursing staff, or practising physicians. If nursing staff (384), the patient record information is retrieved from the appropriate nursing station and the associated patient charts and data entry forms are displayed (386). The correct information is then entered i.e. temperature, blood pressure, medication administered, etc. and then the patient's medical record [stored in a memory] is updated (388). If the user has been identified as a physician (390) then the entire medical record (392) is made

available for viewing at the bedside through the PCS. The physician then enters their personal notes, observations, etc. (394) and the patient's medical record is modified accordingly. It should be noted that no mention has been made as to the specifics of the data entry device; this can either be accomplished directly through a touch panel on the display or through a personal data assistant as will be discussed subsequently.

(Ballantyne, col. 10, lines 10-27)(emphasis added)

Thus, Ballantyne merely discloses entering information through a touch panel to update medical records stored in the memory. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to representing a first collection of media objects on a sheet having a first graphical content and re-marking this sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto this sheet.

Accordingly, Ballantyne fails to disclose re-marking the first sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto the first sheet, wherein the re-marked first sheet provides access to the second collection of the media objects, as recited in amended claim 1.

Because Ballantyne fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Ballantyne under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Given that claims 9, 10, 15, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 44, 49, 50, and 52 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 10, 15, 19, 24, 25, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 44, 49, 50, and 52 are not anticipated by Ballantyne under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 46 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0052888 of Sellen et al. ("Sellen").

Sellen discloses electronic record storage. More specifically, Sellen discloses:

If in step 64 it is determined that the stored time 38s is not later than the paper time 38p (in which case the times ought to be equal), then, in step 83, the user is prompted for the action which is required, for example to "Update" the

stored file with any annotations which have been made to the printed document, or "Not Update". In the latter case, the procedure ends. However, in the former case, in step 86, the user is prompted to scan the content 34p on the paper. Once the user has done this in step 88, then, in step 90, the scanner 26 receives and pieces together an image of the content 34p on the paper. Then, in step 92, the scanner 26 performs an optical character recognition process on the image in order to obtain the content 34p on the paper. Then, in step 94, the content is saved in the file storage with the filename that was extracted in step 60, and in step 96 the stored time 38p for the file is updated with the current time. Then, the procedure ends. Optionally, between steps 92 and 94, the user may then be allowed to edit the content and/or clarify any OCR uncertainties.

(Sellen, paragraph [0032]) (emphasis added)

In particular, Sellen discloses:

It will be appreciated from the above that the procedure readily permits the user: to check whether the paper version of the document is current; to print the current stored version of the document; to compare the paper version of the document and the stored version and to produce a revised document incorporating any changes made to the stored version and any annotations made to the paper version; and to replace the current stored version of the document with the paper version, including any annotations that have been made.

(Sellen, paragraphs [0033]-[0037]) (emphasis added)

Thus, Sellen merely discloses comparing the paper version of the document and the stored version of the document to produce a revised document. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to determining whether a document is erasable that includes scanning a portion of the document to obtain first scanned data; storing the first scanned data in a memory; performing an erasing operation on the scanned portion of the document at the location of the portion; scanning the erased portion of the document to obtain second scanned data; and determining whether the document is erasable based on the first and second scanned data.

Because Sellen fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 46, applicants respectfully submit that claim 46, as amended, is not anticipated by Ballantyne under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claim 47 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2002/0064113 of Geeslin ("Geeslin").

Geeslin merely discloses setting protection states of optical disc media (Abstract). More specifically, Geeslin discloses:

FIG. 1D shows the protection state byte 112 located in the implementation use volume descriptor 110. The protection state byte 112 indicates the protection state of the optical disc 100. In one embodiment of the present invention, the optical disc 100 may have the three protection states as described above. For example, if the optical disc 100 is in the write protection state, the protection state byte 112 indicates that this is the current protection state of the optical disc 100. Thus, when the optical disc 100 is placed into a disc drive (not shown), the protection state byte 112 is read to ascertain that the optical disc 100 is currently in the write protection state.

(Geeslin, paragraph [0032])(emphasis added)

Thus, Geeslin merely discloses protection states bytes that indicate the protection state of the disk. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to a writable mark that includes a shape placed on the coversheet that includes a re-writable paper.

Further, Geeslin merely discloses protection states that prevent writing data to the optical disc. In contrast, amended claim refers to preventing from printing on the coversheet in response to detecting the writable mark.

Accordingly, Geeslin fails to disclose detecting a writable mark when scanning a coversheet, wherein the writable mark includes a shape placed on the coversheet that includes a re-writable paper; and preventing modification to the coversheet that includes preventing from printing on the coversheet in response to detecting the writable mark, as recited in amended claim 47.

Because Geeslin fails to disclose all limitations of amended claim 47, applicants respectfully submit that claim 47, as amended, is not anticipated by Geeslin under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 2-8, 12, 13, 20-23, 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,396,598 to Kashiwagi et al. (“Kashiwagi”).

As set forth above, Ballantyne merely discloses entering information through a touch panel to update medical records stored in the memory, and fails to disclose re-marking the first sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto the first sheet, wherein the re-marked first sheet provides access to the second collection of the media objects, as recited in amended claim 1.

Kashiwagi, in contrast, discloses adding an electronic memo to a paper document. More specifically, Kashiwagi discloses:

Referring to FIGS. 1 to 4, when electronic memo processing apparatus 50 is placed on a document 52, a user 70 can see document 52 through display device 64 with integrated input/output. When an electronic memo 72 is written by means of a pen 60 on tablet 66 and displayed on real time on see through display device 68, operation as if the memo is manually written to document 52 is possible.

(Kashiwagi, col. 10, lines 63-col. 11, line 4)(emphasis added)

In particular, Kashiwagi discloses:

In step 232, new storage of the edited memo, that is, registration is done. A memo ID is newly attached to the memo which has been edited, and a corresponding record is added to the document-memo correspondence information table of document-memo correspondence information 134 and to the memo information table of memo information 132. Further, a new index file such as shown in FIG. 7 is generated, and the index file and the substance of the memo are stored in memo storage 110.

In this manner, it becomes possible to relate, on a computer, a document on a paper medium and an electronic memo related to the document, to display the memo on the document, and to input an electronic memo to the computer by manually writing the memo overlapped with the document.

(Kashiwagi, col. 17, lines 33-47)(emphasis added)

Thus, Kashiwagi discloses editing the document [52] by writing onto a tablet [66] (not onto the document). In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to representing a first collection of media objects on a sheet and re-marking the sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto this sheet.

Thus, neither Ballantyne, nor Kashiwagi discloses, teaches, or suggests such limitations of amended claim 1.

It is respectfully submitted that Ballantyne does not teach or suggest a combination with Kashiwagi, and Kashiwagi does not teach or suggest a combination with Ballantyne. Ballantyne teaches distributing personal health care information. Kashiwagi, in contrast, teaches adding a memo to the document. One of skill in the art would not look at distributing the personal health care information, as taught by Ballantyne, to add the memo to the document, as taught by Kashiwagi.

Furthermore, even if adding of the memo to the document of Kashiwagi were incorporated into the health care information distribution system of Ballantyne, such a combination would still lack representing a first collection of media objects on a sheet and re-marking the sheet that includes writing a second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto this sheet, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 2-8, 12, 13, 20-23, 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, 12, 13, 20-23, 27, 28, 32, 36, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45, 48 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Kashiwagi.

Claims 11, 26, and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,713,148 to Cardullo et al. ("Cardullo").

Cardullo, in contrast, discloses a transponder apparatus, and similar to Ballantyne, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Cardullo, nor Kashiwagi discloses, teaches, or suggests such limitations of amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if the transponder of Cardullo were incorporated into the health care information distribution system of Ballantyne, such a combination would still lack representing a first collection of media objects on a sheet and re-marking the sheet that includes writing a

second graphical content representing the second collection of media objects onto this sheet, as recited in amended claim 1.

Given that claims 11, 26, and 35 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 11, 26, and 35 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Cardullo.

Claims 16-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,260,063 to Ludtke et al. ("Ludtke").

Ludtke, in contrast, discloses an apparatus for representing devices, and similar to Ballantyne, fails to disclose, teach, or suggest the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Ludtke, nor Kashiwagi discloses, teaches, or suggests such limitations of amended claim 1.

Given that claims 16-18 contain the limitations that are similar to those limitations discussed with respect to amended claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-18 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Ludtke.

Claim 51 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ballantyne in view of Sellen.

For at list the same reasons as discussed with respect to amended claims 1 and 46, even if Ballantyne and Sellen were combined such a combination would still lack erasing a portion of a sheet having a representation of a collection of media objects, wherein the representation includes a first graphical content to represent the media objects, wherein the sheet is a cover sheet that provides access to the collection of the media objects; and marking the portion of the sheet with updated information that includes writing a second graphical content onto this sheet, as recited in amended claim 50.

Given that claim 51 depends from amended claim 50, and adds additional limitations, applicants respectfully submit that claim 51 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ballantyne in view of Ludtke.

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 022666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 05/08/2008

By: /Tatiana Rossin/
Tatiana Rossin
Reg. No.: 56,833

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085-4040
(408) 720-8300

Customer No. 008791